

REMARKS

The Office Action, mailed September 26, 2006, considered and rejected claims 1-3, 5-29 and 31-42. Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter.¹ Claims 31, 33 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) in view of *Wong* ("A Role-Based Access Control Model for XML Repositories.") Claims 1-3, 5-29, 32, 34, 35 and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wong* in view of *Box* ("Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) 1.1"). Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wong* and *Box*, and further in view of *Stallings* ("Cryptography and Network Security", Chapter 11). Claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wong* and *Box*, and further in view of *Beckhardt* (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,166). Claim 42 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wong* and *Box*, and further in view of *Ivanov* (U.S. Patent No. 5,706,452).²

By this paper, claims 1, 31, 34 and 36 have been amended, claim 35 cancelled, and no claims added. Accordingly, following this paper, claims 1-3, 5-29, 31-34 and 36-42 remain pending, of which claims 1, 31, 34 and 36 are the only independent claims at issue.

Applicant's invention generally relates to authorizing a user to operate on different types of data structures in a standard manner. As recited in independent claim 1, for example, a method includes maintaining a plurality of role templates that define basic access permissions for one or more command methods. The access permissions are defined by the role templates in a manner that is independent of the type of data structure being accessed. In addition, the role templates are contained within a plurality of role map documents, each of which are specific to a particular computerized service that is configured to perform computerized operations on data structures. Further, a plurality of role definitions are maintained which define access permissions for requesting entities by using one or more of the role templates, and a request from the requesting entity is received so as to perform at least one of the command methods.

¹ Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection was overcome by the claim as previously presented and as currently amended. In particular, the prior claim was limited to "physical" computer readable media. Nevertheless, Applicant has further amended the claim to receive wherein the computer readable media is "storage" media having computer executable instructions "stored thereon".

² Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Moreover, a role definition corresponding to the requesting entity is identified, and access permissions for the requesting entity are determined with respect to the command method by using the role definition corresponding to the requesting entity and a corresponding service application, as identified by an application platform identifier.

Applicant's invention, as claimed in independent method claim 31, is related to the foregoing method, and includes similar recitations, but is recited in functional (step for) language, while the invention as claimed in independent claim 34, recites a computer program product having computer-readable storage media having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing acts generally corresponding to the acts recited in claim 1. Applicant's invention, as claimed for example in independent claim 36, is directed to a corresponding system which generally implements the method of claim 1.

In each of the independent claims, it is clearly recited that a role template defining access permissions with respect to one or more command methods is included within a role map document that is specific to a particular computerized service, as recited in combination with the other recited claim elements. For at least this reason, it is clear that *Wong* fails to anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention, either singly or in combination with the other art of record. In particular, *Wong* fails to teach or suggest a plurality of role map documents which contain role templates and which are specific to computerized services that perform operations on data structures, as recited in combination with the other recited claim elements.

More particularly, *Wong* discloses an XML-based system for defining user roles and thereby determining access permissions of the users with respect to various documents, based on the identity of the user. Specifically, *Wong* teaches the use and maintenance of an RBXAC_xml file which maintains, among other features, a list of users and a role tree. (pp.143- 44). In the list of users, each system user is identified by a unique ID and an optional RolePointer which identifies a "role" of which the user is a member. (p. 144). Each role is, in turn, stored within the role tree in the RBXAC_xml document. (p. 144). The stored roles define what type of user functions (e.g., "acc_functions" such as read, write, create and delete) or administrator functions (e.g., "admin_functions" such as AddUser, RmUser, AddRole, RmRole, AssignRole, DepriveRole, AddAccess, RmAccess, and MvOwner) a person in the specified role is able to perform. (p. 144). The role tree thus provides a hierarchical arrangement of roles which define

the name of each role and an identification of the database functions available to a user having membership in the role. (pp. 141, 144).

Accordingly, *Wong* teaches the use of an XML file to maintain various roles defining user and administrator functions which can be performed by system users, and the storage of the various roles within a role tree which is itself housed within the RBXAC_xml document. *Wong* fails, however, to teach or even suggest that a role tree or RBXAC_xml document is specific to a particular service that operates on the data, as recited in combination with the other claim elements.

For example, in the last Office Action, it was asserted that function requests by the user and administrator function requests are both "services." (Office Action, pp. 2,3). Although Applicant disagrees, Applicant nevertheless notes that the recited limitation includes role map documents which are specific to a particular computerized "service". In contrast, *Wong* describes wherein each role within the role tree and XML document include both user functions and administrator functions. Thus, to the extent the user and administrator functions are considered "services", the XML document and role tree each include both "services" and are, accordingly, not specific to any particular service, as recited in combination with the other claim elements. This is particularly true when considering that the services may be external to the role map document (claim 43), whereas *Wong* discloses that the user and administrator functions are each defined within the role tree and RBXAX_xml document.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone at (801)533-9800.

Dated this 26th day of December, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rick D. Nydegger". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "R" and "N".

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
COLBY C. NUTTALL
Registration No. 58,146
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:JCJ:CCN:gd
AHY0000002292V001